



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/615,765 | 07/09/2003 | Chi-Yang Lin | 3304.2.67 | 9909 |

21552 7590 12/10/2004

MADSON & METCALF
GATEWAY TOWER WEST
SUITE 900
15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

EXAMINER

TUNG, KEE M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2676

DATE MAILED: 12/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/615,765

Applicant(s)

LIN ET AL.

Examiner

Kee M Tung

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/9/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/22/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Datar et al (6,625,740 hereinafter "Datar") in view of Ellenby et al (6,064,398 hereinafter "Ellenby").

Datar teaches a method (Fig. 1 and respective areas of the specification) for accessing image data in a computer system (Fig. 1), said computer system comprising a core logic unit (combination of North bridge 103 and south bridge 110 form the system core logic chipset, col. 3, lines 6-8), a system memory (102), a graphics accelerator (107), an AGP bus (106), and an image data outputting device (not shown, but would be obvious to connect to 117 and 118, col. 4, lines 10-15) in communication with a south bridge chip of said core logic unit, said method comprising receiving image data from said image data outputting device by said core logic unit (input from 117 via PCI bus 105 to core logic unit); writing said image data into an AGP memory block of said system memory and accessing said image data in said AGP memory block by said graphics accelerator (inherent by the teachings of AGP bus because one of the reason to use AGP bus is for the graphics accelerator to directly access portion of the system memory, such as, AGP memory block which is usually for storing texture data).

Furthermore, Ellenby teaches an image outputting device (camera 102, col. 5, lines 39-60 and col. 6, lines 12-20) connects to chipset (104) and the chipset (104) can burst image data to anywhere in the CPU's main memory (includes the claimed AGP portion of the main memory) or to any PCI slave device's memory (col. 6, lines 12-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of image data outputting device of Ellenby into the system and/or method of Datar in order to receive image data from other electronic devices, such as, a camera into the image processing system for processing and thus to be able to provide a high quality image in real time. Therefore, at least claims 1-10 would have been obvious.

Claims 11-17 are similar in scope to claims 1-8, and rejected under similar rationale. Claim 11 additionally requires to determine whether said received data is image data which would have been obvious by the teachings of chipset (104) because Ellenby teaches the chipset accepts the IEEE 1394 data from camera 102 and generates command and image data (col. 5, lines 61-67). Therefore, at least claim 11 would have been obvious.

3. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Datar et al (6,625,740 hereinafter "Datar") in view of or Dendinger (6,714,891).

Datar teaches a method (Fig. 1 and respective areas of the specification) for accessing image data in a computer system (Fig. 1), said computer system comprising a core logic unit (combination of North bridge 103 and south bridge 110 form the system core logic chipset, col. 3, lines 6-8), a system memory (102), a graphics accelerator

(107), an AGP bus (106), and an image data outputting device (not shown, but would be obvious to connect to 117 and 118, col. 4, lines 10-15) in communication with a south bridge chip of said core logic unit, said method comprising receiving image data from said image data outputting device by said core logic unit (input from 117 via PCI bus 105 to core logic unit); writing said image data into an AGP memory block of said system memory and accessing said image data in said AGP memory block by said graphics accelerator (inherent by the teachings of AGP bus because one of the reason to use AGP bus is for the graphics accelerator to directly access portion of the system memory, such as, AGP memory block which is usually for storing texture data). Furthermore, Dendinger teaches an image outputting device (digital camera, col. 7, lines 11-17) connects to bus controller (246) which is also functions as a bus bridge to provide an interface to PCI bus (256, col. 7, lines 5-8) and the memory controller (223/323) and bus controller (246/325) forms as the core logic unit (col. 8, lines 1-3 and col. 9, lines 26-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of image data outputting device of Dendinger into the system and/or method of Datar in order to receive image data from an electronic devices, such as, a camera into the image processing system for processing and thus to be able to provide a high quality image in real time. Therefore, at least claims 1-10 would have been obvious.

Claims 11-17 are similar in scope to claims 1-8, and rejected under similar rationale. Claim 11 additionally requires to determine whether said received data is image data which would have been obvious by the teachings of the digital camera

(Dendinger, col. 7, line 14) because data from digital camera is considered image data to ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, at least claim 11 would have been obvious.

4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (US 2002/0144030) in view of Ellenby et al (6,064,398 hereinafter "Ellenby").

Miller teaches a method (Fig. 1 and respective areas of the specification) for accessing image data in a computer system (Fig. 1), said computer system comprising a core logic unit (combination of North bridge 120 and south bridge 150 form the system core logic chipset, page 2, paragraph 14), a system memory (130), a graphics accelerator (connect to AGP slot 140), an AGP bus (the bus between AGP slot and north bridge), and an image data outputting device (not shown, but would be obvious to connect to USB port 180) in communication with a south bridge chip of said core logic unit, said method comprising receiving image data from said image data outputting device by said core logic unit (input from 180 to south bridge 150); writing said image data into an AGP memory block of said system memory and accessing said image data in said AGP memory block by said graphics accelerator (inherent by the teachings of AGP bus because one of the reason to use AGP bus is for the graphics accelerator to directly access portion of the system memory, such as, AGP memory block which is usually for storing texture data). Furthermore, Ellenby teaches an image outputting device (camera 102, col. 5, lines 39-60 and col. 6, lines 12-20) connects to chipset (104) and the chipset (104) can burst image data to anywhere in the CPU's main memory (includes the claimed AGP portion of the main memory) or to any PCI slave device's memory (col. 6, lines 12-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of image data outputting device of Ellenby into the system and/or method of Miller in order to receive image data from other electronic devices, such as, a camera into the image processing system for processing and thus to be able to provide a high quality image in real time. Therefore, at least claims 1-10 would have been obvious.

Claims 11-17 are similar in scope to claims 1-8, and rejected under similar rationale. Claim 11 additionally requires to determine whether said received data is image data which would have been obvious by the teachings of chipset (104) because Ellenby teaches the chipset accepts the IEEE 1394 data from camera 102 and generates command and image data (col. 5, lines 61-67). Therefore, at least claim 11 would have been obvious.

5. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (US 2002/0144030) in view of Dendinger (6,714,891).

Miller teaches a method (Fig. 1 and respective areas of the specification) for accessing image data in a computer system (Fig. 1), said computer system comprising a core logic unit (combination of North bridge 120 and south bridge 150 form the system core logic chipset, page 2, paragraph 14), a system memory (130), a graphics accelerator (connect to AGP slot 140), an AGP bus (the bus between AGP slot and north bridge), and an image data outputting device (not shown, but would be obvious to connect to USB port 180) in communication with a south bridge chip of said core logic unit, said method comprising receiving image data from said image data outputting device by said core logic unit (input from 180 to south bridge 150); writing said image

data into an AGP memory block of said system memory and accessing said image data in said AGP memory block by said graphics accelerator (inherent by the teachings of AGP bus because one of the reason to use AGP bus is for the graphics accelerator to directly access portion of the system memory, such as, AGP memory block which is usually for storing texture data). Furthermore, Dendinger teaches an image outputting device (digital camera, col. 7, lines 11-17) connects to bus controller (246) which is also functions as a bus bridge to provide an interface to PCI bus (256, col. 7, lines 5-8) and the memory controller (223/323) and bus controller (246/325) forms as the core logic unit (col. 8, lines 1-3 and col. 9, lines 26-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of image data outputting device of Dendinger into the system and/or method of Datar in order to receive image data from an electronic devices, such as, a camera into the image processing system for processing and thus to be able to provide a high quality image in real time. Therefore, at least claims 1-10 would have been obvious.


Claims 11-17 are similar in scope to claims 1-8, and rejected under similar rationale. Claim 11 additionally requires to determine whether said received data is image data which would have been obvious by the teachings of the digital camera (Dendinger, col. 7, line 14) because data from digital camera is considered image data to ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, at least claim 11 would have been obvious.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kee M Tung whose telephone number is 703-305-9660. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday - Friday from 5:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on 703-308-6829. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kee M Tung
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2676